

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 1 to 3, 5 to 12 and 22 to 27, claims 22 to 27 stand withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention but have not been cancelled. The typographical error in claim 1 has been corrected.

All of the claims were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over the Newman et al patent taken in view of the Lockard patent optionally taken in further view of a tertiary reference. The Examiner states that the Newman et al patent describes connecting piece 102 which is pressed onto the wire end to element 72 which is used to plug the contact piece to the connecting piece and the Examiner concedes that Newman et al fails to disclose laser welding and encapsulating after welding. The Lockard patent is cited to show laser welding in line 37 of column 6 and encapsulating after welding in Figure 16 and deems it would have been obvious to modify Newman et al by using the laser welding in place of a screw as taught by Lockard for the purpose of preventing the wires from coming off the leads prematurely and to protect from the environment.


Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection since it is deemed that the combination of the prior art that the Examiner has made with the benefit of

Applicant's invention would not suggest Applicant's novel method to one skilled in the art. Applicant's invention is directed to establishing an electrical connection between at least one connecting piece of a workpiece and at least one wire by preparing an end of the wire with a contact piece matched to the connecting piece and then positioning the contact piece on the connecting piece and welding the contact piece to the connecting piece by laser radiation.

In contrast thereto, the Newman et al patent is not directed to such a connection but, rather, connects a wire by the use of a screw. There is no connection whatsoever of welding a contact piece to a connecting piece but, rather, Newman et al secures the wire by a screw. The combination of Newman et al with Lockard does not obviate this ground of rejection since Lockard only discloses laser welding of a wire to a connecting piece. In lines 36 to 40 of column 6, Lockard discloses laser welding of wires (conductors) to slots of a contact piece and this is not the same as laser radiation of a contact piece to a connecting piece and therefore, the combination of the prior art does not teach Applicant's method and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly point out Applicant's patentable contribution and favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683  
Attorney for Applicant  
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds  
Enclosure